

- Third, the word processor capitalizes the word that follows a FIG. Symbol, as this sentence shows.
- Fourth, a missing period does not reduce the readability of a patent application in any meaningful way.

Therefore it seems like a waste of time for both the USPTO and for me to replace all instances of FIG with “FIG.” In the present application (see, another instance of incorrect capitalization). Adding a period would consume another 50 pages of paper, and incur the unnecessary expenses of (1) me making the requested conversion, (2) paper and printing, (3) mailing costs, (4) USPTO receiving costs, (5) electronic scanning costs, and (6) an examiner’s proofreading costs for enforcement.

These reasons suggest that the office FIG objection—and requested solution—are unreasonable for any readability benefits that might possibly be obtained, if and when anyone ever reads the present application in the future.

It seems to me that we should concentrate our efforts on more meaningful things such as legitimate claim objections and responses.

Again, I will comply with your request if you confirm it with another office action. But I respectfully request the office to reconsider and withdraw this objection.

6 Summary of This Letter

In this letter, I have tried to save the USPTO and myself needless prosecution effort caused by reciting irrelevant prior art and objecting to patent application titles containing the word “collection.”

My approach was to explain why I chose the claim and title wordings that are present in the application. In particular, I tried to show how I act as my own lexicographer, and assign special meanings to words such as “collection.”

I hope that this letter will make it easier for the USPTO to properly prosecute my patent pending applications.

Respectfully yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K Jameson', with a stylized, cursive script.

Kevin W Jameson